

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

VITUS GROUP, LLC; VITUS  
DEVELOPMENT IV, LLC; RIVERWOOD  
TOWNHOMES, INC.; RIVERWOOD  
HOUSING PARTNERS, LP; GREEN  
MEADOWS HOUSING MANAGEMENT,  
LLC; GREEN MEADOWS HOUSING  
PARTNERS, LP; WESTLAKE LINWOOD  
HOUSING PARTNERS, LP; WESTLAKE  
LINWOOD HOUSING MANAGEMENT,  
LLC; PINES HOUSING PARTNERS, LP; and  
HILTON HEAD HOUSING PARTNERS, LP,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

No. 2:24-cv-00282-RAJ

AMENDED ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion to File their First Amended Complaint, Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, and Supporting Declaration of Suyash Agrawal Under Seal. Dkt. # 30. The instant matter stems from an insurance dispute between Plaintiffs Vitus Group, LLC, Vitus Development IV, LLC, Riverwood Housing Partners, LP, Green Meadows Housing Management, LLC, Green  
ORDER – 1

1 Meadows Housing Partners, LP, Westlake Linwood Housing Partners, LP, Westlake  
2 Linwood Housing Management, LLC, Pines Housing Partners, LP, and Hilton Head  
3 Housing Partners, LP (collectively “Vitus”) and Defendant Admiral Insurance Company  
4 (“Admiral”). Plaintiffs are the insureds under primary liability insurance policies  
5 purchased from Admiral. Dkt. # 31 (First Amended Complaint) ¶ 1.2. Plaintiffs allege  
6 that Admiral has, over Plaintiffs’ opposition, accepted policy-limit settlement demands in  
7 connection with several alleged shootings that have occurred on housing complexes  
8 owned by Plaintiffs. *Id.* ¶ 1.3. According to Plaintiffs, Admiral’s actions are premature  
9 and have exposed Vitus to liability in connection with the underlying alleged shootings.  
10 *Id.* ¶ 1.5. Plaintiffs filed their complaint in King County Superior Court, and Admiral  
11 then removed the matter to federal court. Dkt. # 1, 1-2. Admiral has filed to dismiss or  
12 stay this action in favor of two interpleader lawsuits that Admiral filed in Georgia. Dkt. #  
13 14. Vitus opposes Admiral’s motion. Dkt. # 34. Plaintiffs have moved to remand the  
14 matter to King County Superior Court. Dkt. # 36.

15 Plaintiffs now seek to seal the First Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 32) and file a  
16 redacted version (Dkt. # 31), seal its Opposition to Admiral’s Motion to Dismiss or Stay  
17 (Dkt. # 34) and file a redacted version (Dkt. # 33), and seal the accompanying  
18 Declaration of Suyash Agrawal ISO Plaintiff’s Opposition and supporting exhibits (Dkt.  
19 # 35). Dkt. # 30. Admiral does not oppose this request.

20 In the Western District of Washington, “there is a strong presumption of public  
21 access to the court’s files.” Western District of Washington Local Civil Rule (“LCR”)  
22 5(g). “Only in rare circumstances should a party file a motion, opposition, or reply under  
23 seal.” LCR 5(g)(5). Normally the moving party must include “a specific statement of the  
24 applicable legal standard and the reasons for keeping a document under seal, with  
25 evidentiary support from declarations where necessary.” LCR 5(g)(3)(B).

26 Under LCR 5(g), when a party files a stipulated motion to seal a document, the  
27 party must certify that all parties have conferred in an attempt to reach agreement as to  
28

1 the need to seal and to minimize the amount of material filed under seal, and explore  
2 redaction and other alternatives to filing under seal. LCR 5(g)(3)(A). Further, the party  
3 must set forth a “specific statement of the applicable legal standard and the reasons for  
4 keeping a document under seal, including an explanation of: (i) the legitimate private or  
5 public interest that warrant the relief sought; (ii) the injury that will result if the relief  
6 sought is not granted; and (iii) why a less restrictive alternative to the relief sought is not  
7 sufficient.” LCR 5(g)(3)(B).

8 Although attorney-client privilege and the work-product doctrine may be  
9 “compelling reason[s]” to seal documents, *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435  
10 F.3d 110, 125 (2nd Cir. 2006), “only in rare circumstances should” a motion, opposition,  
11 or reply be filed under seal. LCR 5(g)(5). Instead, a party should “redact the confidential  
12 information” and file the unredacted pleading under seal, along with a motion to seal.  
13 LCR 5(g)(5)(A)-(B).

14 Here, Plaintiffs argue that there is good cause to seal the amended complaint,  
15 opposition brief, and declaration and supporting exhibits in order to protect privileged  
16 communications between the parties. Plaintiffs have filed a redacted copy of the amended  
17 complaint and opposition, *see* Dkt. ## 31, 33, but the opposition’s supporting declaration  
18 and exhibits have been filed under seal in their entirety. *See* Dkt. # 35.

19 The Court finds the proposed redactions to the amended complaint and opposition  
20 to Admiral’s motion to dismiss to be reasonable to protect privileged communications  
21 between the parties. Here, Plaintiff has requested a less restrictive alternative to sealing  
22 entire documents, *see* LCR 5(g)(3)(B), and this request is unopposed. The Court  
23 **GRANTS** Plaintiffs’ request as to the amended complaint (filed under seal at Dkt. # 32)  
24 and opposition (filed under seal at Dkt. # 34).

25 As to Plaintiffs’ request to seal the supporting declaration and exhibits, this Court  
26 must balance Plaintiffs’ interest in maintaining the confidentiality of privileged  
27 conversations with the right of public access. The sealing of entire documents fails to

1 accomplish this goal and Plaintiffs fail to show why a less restrictive alternative to  
2 sealing, such as redaction, is not sufficient to protect privileged communications. *See*  
3 LCR 5(g). Therefore, Plaintiffs' request to seal the supporting declaration and exhibits  
4 (Dkt. # 35) is **DENIED** without prejudice. Plaintiffs may re-file the motion to seal and  
5 propose narrowly tailored redactions to the Agrawal declaration and exhibits. Plaintiffs  
6 shall file any motion to seal containing revised redactions within **fourteen (14) days**. The  
7 Clerk shall not unseal any currently sealed documents filed pending further order of this  
8 Court.

9 DATED this 9th day of May, 2024.

10   
11

12 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28